



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,797	04/27/2001	Koichiro Tanaka	12732-034001	7383
26171	7590	05/21/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. 11TH FLOOR WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500			GUERRERO, MARIA F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2822	

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/842,797

Applicant(s)

TANAKA, KOICHIRO

Examiner

Maria Guerrero

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2822

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed February 23, 2004.

Claims 1-30 are pending.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-18 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (U.S. 5,365,080) in view of G. Andra et al. and Applicant admitted prior art.

Yamazaki et al. teaches forming a first crystalline region by irradiating laser beam to an amorphous semiconductor film while relatively moving the laser beam with respect to the amorphous semiconductor film and after forming the first crystalline region forming a second by irradiating laser beam to an amorphous semiconductor film while relatively moving the laser beam with respect to the amorphous semiconductor film (Fig. 4(A)-4(E), col. 2, lines 20-35, col. 4, lines 50-68). Yamazaki et al. shows the second crystalline region including a portion of the first crystalline region and the second crystalline region overlaps with the first crystalline region (Fig. 4(B)-4E, col. 4, lines 65-

Art Unit: 2822

68, col. 5, lines 1-5). Yamazaki et al. teaches employing a YAG laser or argon laser to crystallize the semiconductor film (col. 5, lines 1-5, col. 6, lines 1-10). In addition, Yamazaki et al. teaches the semiconductor device being used in a liquid crystal display device and other devices (col. 1, lines 9-13).

4. Yamazaki et al. is silent about moving the laser on a second direction parallel to the first direction on the upper part of the layer with an overlapping region. However, this is part of the well-known scanning process as evidence Applicant admitted prior art (Fig. 4A-4C, 27A-27C, pages 7-10).

Yamazaki et al. is silent about the wavelength of the laser beam. However, G. Andra et al. shows employing the argon laser with the wavelength of 514 nm and employing an Nd: YAG laser pulse with the wavelength of 532 nm (pages 639-640).

Since Yamazaki et al. and G. Andra et al. are both from the same field of endeavor of laser-induced crystallization, the purpose disclosed by G. Andra et al. would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Yamazaki et al.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yamazaki et al. reference by specifying moving the laser on a second direction parallel to the first direction on the upper part of the layer with an overlapping region as taught Applicant admitted prior art and the wavelength as taught G. Andra et al. in order to control the size of the grains in the crystallized layer (G. Andra et al., page 639; Yamazaki et al.)

5. Claims 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (U.S. 5,365,080), G. Andra et al. and Applicant admitted prior art as

Art Unit: 2822

applied to claims 1-18, 25-30 above, and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (U.S. 5,893,730).

6. Regarding claims 19-24, the combination of Yamazaki et al., G. Andra et al., and Applicant admitted prior art does not specifically show the semiconductor device as being part of a video camera, a personal computer etc. However, Yamazaki et al. shows that these devices utilize semiconductor devices (Fig. 16A-16F, col. 24, lines 58-67, col. 25, lines 1-47).

Since Yamazaki et al.'080 and Yamazaki et al. '730 are both from the same field of endeavor of crystallization, the purpose disclosed by Yamazaki et al. '730 would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Yamazaki et al. '080.

7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Yamazaki et al., G. Andra et al., and Applicant admitted prior art by specifying the use of the semiconductor device as being part of a video camera, a personal computer etc. as taught Yamazaki et al. '730 because these devices utilize the display device taught by Yamazaki et al. '080 (Yamazaki et al. '730, col. 24, lines 58-67).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Imahashi et al. (U.S. 5,413,958) is cited as evidence to show that

Art Unit: 2822

that moving the laser on a second direction parallel to the first direction on the upper part of the layer with an overlapping region is conventional in the art.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maria Guerrero whose telephone number is 571-272-1837.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amir Zarabian can be reached on 571-272-1852. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2822

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Maria Guerrero
Primary Examiner
May 13, 2004